DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 490 HE 021 428

AUTHOR Amos, Arthur K., Jr.
TITLE Advising at UC Davis: A Report of Student Opinions.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Davis. Office of Student Affairs Research and Information.
PUB DATE Mar 88
NOTE 23p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Advising; *Career Planning; *College Students; Higher Education; Institutional Research; *Job Placement; Participant Satisfaction; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *University of California Davis

ABSTRACT

The perceptions of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students about advising at the University of California, Davis, were surveyed in spring 1987. Of the sample of 1,565 students, 51.2% responded. Responses of Davis students were compared with norms derived from a sample of colleges with populations larger than 10,000 students that were surveyed between during 1984-1986. Major findings include: students feel positive about the information they receive prior to enrolling; students appreciate and use the various sources of academic advising found on campus; freshmen report less use than their national counterparts of academic advising services (59.5% versus 67.4%); not all students were able to easily meet with their faculty advisors and some students received misleading or contradictory information; students who used career planning services or job placement services reported moderately high levels of satisfaction; and undergraduates deferred use of career planning and job placement services until late in their academic careers. It is suggested that many students do not get into the advising system early enough in their academic careers to take full advantage of the services offered. Specific comments of respondents are included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED294490

ADVISING AT UC DAVIS

A Report of Student Opinions

Arthur K. Amos, Jr.

Student Affairs Research and Information

University of California, Davis

March 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. David Haggerty

Univ of CA, Davis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 021 428

ADVISING AT UC DAVIS
A Report of Student Opinions

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study examines the perceptions of undergraduate, graduate and professional students about advising at UC Davis. It uses data collected with a survey mailed to a stratified random sample of 1565 students. Of the surveys mailed, 51.2% were returned.

The study identifies the following major findings:

Davis students feel positive about the information they receive prior to enrolling. Undergraduates are consistently more satisfied than their peers nationally with the accuracy of pre-enrollment information, with the accuracy of the college catalog and admissions publications, and with college orientation programs.

Davis students appreciate and use the various sources of academic advising found on campus.

Davis freshmen report less use than their national counterparts of academic advising services (59.5% versus 67.4%).

Davis undergraduates report about the same levels of satisfaction with the availability of their advisors and the value of the advice provided as do their national counterparts.

The comments of the respondents suggest that not all students can easily meet with their faculty advisors and that some students receive misleading or contradictory information.

Respondents who have used career planning services or job placement services report moderately high levels of satisfaction with those services. Indeed, undergraduates report greater satisfaction with such services at Davis than do their counterparts at commensurate institutions.

Davis undergraduates defer use of career planning and job placement services until late in their academic careers and so are less able to use career advising in planning their academic careers.

INTRODUCTION

In Spring 1987 Student Affairs Research and Information surveyed students at UC Davis to determine their perceptions of campus strengths and weaknesses. Using a questionnaire developed by the American College Testing Program (ACT) and a set of campus-specific questions, respondents provided their opinions about a range of campus programs and services, and evaluated various aspects of the college environment. We sent the survey to a sample of UC Davis undergraduate, graduate and professional students; a second mailing to non-respondents followed four weeks later. This report reflects data from a 51.2% response rate overall.

We constructed a sample of 1565 students, disproportionately stratified by ethnicity and level; therefore, ratios of sample to population vary by subpopulation and the analysis of the whole population uses weighted values. For responses to questions of satisfaction, we assigned numeric values on a scale from 5 (Very Satisfied) to 1 (Very Dissatisfied). We then multiplied the response value by a weighting factor that took into account respondent ethnicity, gender and class level.

This analysis uses means to compare Davis responses with norms derived from a sample of colleges with populations larger than 10,000 students surveyed between January 1, 1984 and December 31, 1986. Davis means reported here are, unless otherwise noted, for undergraduate respondents. In particular, mean responses reported for individual ethnic groups are only for undergraduates. These means must, however, be viewed with caution. Weighting of Davis responses and the nature of the response scale render these numbers imprecise when making comparisons with colleges nationally.[1]

This report discusses academic advising services at Davis. The body of the report contains summary statistics; the Appendix attached presents tables of the complete responses to relevant questions.

Many educators believe that the nature, quality and availability of academic advice profoundly affects the academic experience of students. Although it is difficult to isolate advising from the rest of the academic experience, the following areas can be identified:

I. Pre-enrollment advising--The ACT questionnaire includes questions on the "accuracy of college information . . . received before enrolling," "college catalog/admissions publications," and "college orientation program."

II. Academic advising--The ACT questionnaire measures satisfaction with "academic advising services," "availability" of advisors, and "value of the information provided" by advisors.

III. Career advising--This area is included under the rubric "academic advising" because of the consequences that career advising and counseling have on a student's academic career.

[1]An appendix further discussing methodology is available upon request.

In addition to answering specific questions about the various kinds of advising found at UC Davis, many respondents addressed the matter directly in the survey's Comments section. This section asked respondents: "What is your advice [to the new chancellor] for strengthening UC Davis." The wording of this instruction may have encouraged respondents to focus their remarks on weaknesses rather than strengths.

PRE-ENROLLMENT ADVISING

Pre-enrollment Information

All respondents--undergraduate, graduate and professional students--generally report satisfaction with the "accuracy of college information" they received prior to enrolling at UC Davis. The mean satisfaction rating reported by all undergraduates compares favorably with national norms (3.71 versus 3.63). Women, particularly undergraduates, are more likely than men to be Very Satisfied or Satisfied with pre-enrollment information (68.7% versus 61.2% for all male respondents and 70.0% versus 59.9% for undergraduate women and men respectively). This finding follows national patterns.

Subtle differences exist among the distributions of undergraduate responses by ethnic subgroups. Chicanos, for example, are least likely to feel Neutral about pre-enrollment information and most likely to report either high or low levels of satisfaction. Few Asians report being Very Satisfied (6.5%); most report being Satisfied or Neutral (87.8%). Blacks and Chicanos are by far the most likely to report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied (63.4% and 68.8% respectively) with pre-enrollment information.

College Catalog

Respondents at all levels, post-baccalaureate as well as undergraduate, appear quite satisfied with the General Catalog and Admissions publications. Davis undergraduates rate "college catalog/admissions publications" slightly higher than the mean satisfaction reported in the national norms (3.99 versus 3.86). More than four-fifths of the undergraduates and almost two-thirds of the graduate and professional students report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied (81.0% and 64.5% respectively) with this variable.

Among undergraduates, Engineering respondents in particular report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied with college catalogs and Admissions publications (91.0% versus 81.2% for Agricultural & Environmental Sciences and 78.7% for Letters & Science). Greater satisfaction with the accuracy of these materials possibly results from the rigorous structure of Engineering programs, making them easier to describe than curricula in Letters and Science or Agricultural and Environmental Sciences; also, Engineering publishes a separate college Bulletin. This level of satisfaction suggests that the other colleges should examine Engineering's pre-enrollment materials.

College Orientation

Of the slightly less than two-thirds of undergraduate respondents who indicate participation in "college orientation programs," more than three-quarters (77.1%) report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied with them. Overall, undergraduates report a somewhat higher participation rate than that reported in the national norms (64.1% versus 63.1%); similarly, UC Davis reflects a higher mean satisfaction rating (4.03 versus 3.87).

Predictably, participation rates decline by undergraduate class level; more freshmen report participation in orientation programs than sophomores or upper division students, while seniors report the least participation. But satisfaction declines by class level as well: many more freshmen than seniors report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied with college orientation (89.6% versus 76.2% for sophomores, 74.8% for juniors & 71.1% for seniors). Some decline in satisfaction probably stems from the relative loss of immediacy of the material and advice shared during orientation. Also, some dissatisfaction may result from differing orientation needs between new freshmen and transfer students. This result suggests a possible need to review the clients of orientation programs to see if their needs are met.

Comments about Pre-enrollment Information

The sparsity of comments concerning pre-enrollment information supports the generally high levels of satisfaction indicated in the responses to the questions.

One senior respondent who did not attend the summer orientation program noted that "I came to UCD not aware of what services were offered and where I could go for help. I lived in an apartment with my sister [my] freshman year and she was not very informative at all." For one student, at least, missing the orientation program proved to be a drawback. Perhaps it would be useful to send a checklist of steps to perform after arriving on campus to those unable to participate in the Summer Advising program.

Academic Advising

UC Davis delivers academic advising in a number of ways, including:

1. Faculty Advising--Faculty perform a substantial proportion of departmental and major advising. Graduate and professional students receive virtually all advising from their faculty advisors.

2. Staff Advising--Most departments assign one or more staff to provide some academic advising to students. The level of advising provided varies by department, ranging from clerical support for faculty advisors to substantial advising support overseen by master faculty advisors. Each college also provides staff level academic advising. Additional staff providing academic and career advice can

be found in Advising Services, Work Learn/Career Planning and Placement, and the Learning Skills Center.

3. Peer Advising--Academic Peer Advisors work in about thirty-five academic departments. The Academic Peer Advising program supplements faculty and staff academic advising.

4. Additional Advising--Students receive academic advice from a variety of additional formal and informal sources, including deans, fellow students, tutors, Counseling Center staff, and other faculty and staff not formally charged with this function.

The large variety of sources of academic advising on the Davis campus partially obscures the results of the student opinion survey. It is not always possible to identify the kind of academic advising with which students express satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Accordingly, interpretations of these results should be treated with some caution.

Academic Advising Services

More than two-thirds of the survey respondents indicate using "academic advising services" (77.3% of all undergraduates and 44.0% of all graduate and professional students). This result compares with a national norm of 75.6%. The mean satisfaction of all undergraduates (3.69) is higher than the national norm (3.52), suggesting that the campus's efforts in this area are not unappreciated.

Students indicate general satisfaction with academic advising, with undergraduates slightly more satisfied than graduate students. Usage of academic advising services varies widely by subgroup. In particular, Blacks use academic advising more extensively than other students (90.6% versus 74.8%). An even greater difference exists between freshmen and juniors (59.5% versus 84.1%). To some extent we would expect usage of academic advising to go up with time on campus, but the fact that only two-fifths of Davis freshmen report having received academic advising is cause for some concern. In addition, although the pattern of usage and class level for undergraduates corresponds to national patterns, Davis freshman usage falls below the national norm for freshmen (59.5% versus 67.4%).

Availability of Advisor

Asked about the "availability of your advisor," UC Davis undergraduates report slightly higher levels of satisfaction than the national norms (3.57 versus 3.54); graduate students, however, report much higher satisfaction rates (3.98). Slightly more than half of undergraduates (54.4%) say that they are Very Satisfied or Satisfied; about one-third report being Neutral about the availability of advisors.

Where subgroups differ in their responses to this question, the differences come largely from changes in the percents who are Neutral. Thus, for example, graduate and professional students are generally more satisfied than undergraduates and substantially fewer are Neutral on this item (13.7% versus 34.1%).

Overall satisfaction among undergraduates varies only slightly by level although more freshmen and sophomores report being Neutral on the issue than juniors and seniors. This pattern, duplicated on the national level, suggests at least two possibilities:

> Students make up their minds about the availability of advisors as their careers progress.
>
> Advanced students seek out academic advising more readily than less advanced students.

Value of Information Provided by Advisor

Undergraduate respondents report a slightly lower mean satisfaction rating regarding the "value of information provided by your advisor" than reported nationwide (3.39 versus 3.41). The Davis means are, in keeping with the national patterns, lower than the corresponding ones for "advisors availability" and "academic advising services"; this finding suggests that the mere presence and use of academic advising do not make the information valuable to students.

Fewer respondents report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied with the value of the information provided by their advisors than with the availability of advisors (51.6% versus 59.9%) and more say that they are Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied (17.4% versus 11.0%). Undergraduates are less likely to report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied than graduate and professional students (48.8% versus 60.2%).

Engineering students appear to be the least satisfied of the undergraduates; only 30.1% report being Very Satisfied or Satisfied (versus 57.1% for Agricultural & Environmental Sciences and 48.4% for Letters & Science), while 25.1% say they were Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied (versus 15.3% for Agricultural & Environmental Sciences and 17.2% for Letters & Science).

There is considerable diversity of response among the ethnic subgroups of undergraduates. More Blacks report being Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied (24.2% versus 16.2% for Chicanos and 18.2% for American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos). American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos are least likely to report Very Satisfied or Satisfied (44.0% versus 52.9% for Blacks and 50.8% for Chicanos).

Comments about Academic Advising Services

Many students chose to comment on academic advising. These comments responded to a broad request--"What is your advice for strengthening UC Davis?"--and they may take a tone more negative than one would expect, given their answers to the questions about academic advising.

Several comments indicate general dissatisfaction with academic advising. Examples include:

> *UC Davis needs to improve...departmental advising.*

> *After spending four years at Davis as an undergraduate and three years as a professional school student, I feel that...major problem areas at UCD [include] very poor advising services.*

> *Academic Advising in the Graduate Division is poorly organized and not presented well to the student.*

Some general and specific compliments balance these general complaints:

> *This campus has many strengths though, especially in advising services, athletic programs, and general education.*

> *As a student, I'm quite satisfied with the education that I have received in this institution. I'm very impressed by the extensive counseling and advising services...available to us; please keep [up] the good work; don't ever cut these programs. UCD campus is still growing, but please don't sacrifice quality for quantity.*

> *The Financial Aid and Bio Sci Advising are GREAT here. The people in these two offices are warm, concerned and exceptional.*

And two rather mixed reviews:

> *The counseling I have received has been adequate. However, I still do not know what classes transferred with how many units, although I have asked.*

> *My previous advisor was nothing more than an uninformed figure-head. My current advisor is fine.*

On balance, the general comments suggest that students regard academic advising at Davis positively, but not wholly so; the experiences of some respondents appear to have been unsatisfactory. Other, more specific comments reveal some weaknesses in academic advising at Davis.

Even though responses to the question indicated generally high levels of satisfaction with the availability of advisors, some students were unhappy with this aspect of advising:

> *UC Davis needs professors that will have more office hours available to their students; UCD needs evaluation sheets for the students to evaluate their advisors.*

> *As far as career services, the Minority Engineering Program and EOP have helped me a tremendous amount. I have NEVER seen or spoken to my advisor. He*

is always still on vacation through orientation week (all 3 quarters) and I need to get another Engineering professor to clear my fee holds. I don't know how I would manage without EOP, MEP, CALESS, & Learning Skills Center.

The availability of the Bio Sci Advisors is too scarce. It was hard for me to get help when I needed it.

When I first came to UCD, I was assigned an advisor. When I went to see him 2 or 3 days before school started (Fall 1984) there was a note on the door which said he was on sabbatical, so I started seeing the peer adviser for the College of Letters & Science. A few months later I filled out the forms to transfer to the College of Ag. without any of the requirements to do so. To my surprise, I was accepted to the College with no questions asked. To me, this indicates that there is something wrong with the current system in progress today.

The relationship between graduate students and their advisors differs significantly from those of undergraduates. Specifically, graduate students may have special problems with the availability of their advisors:

The only trouble I have had as a graduate student at UCD has been dealing with an advisor who is not the same as my major professor. I do not see a need to keep these two roles separate. If my major professor is the one following all my progress very closely, this person is always in the best position to advise me in academic matters.

However, one point I would like to criticize about UC Davis...the work on evaluation of the capacity or load of this campus has not been done well. Many graduate students are accepted each quarter, each year, yet they cannot find a suitable major advisor to follow, nor can they get wholesome financial aid, especially international students. The funds of this campus as well as of individual faculty are very limited, which has forced some students [to] take plan II (no thesis) in their major programs. It should be worked through to alleviate this problem!

My advisor (R. L. Baldwin) is noted for his excellence in teaching, research and the care with which he treats his students (financial, personal). Other students are not so lucky. I came here specifically because of Dr. Baldwin and would do so again.

Currently students unhappy with advisor availability constitute only a small minority. This situation could change if accommodations are not made when, as seems a probable consequence of growth, the campus expands its hours of instruction. With restricted hours of instruction, it may be assumed that sometime during the week a student and his/her faculty advisor will be on campus and free at the same time--not always, but often. As the hours of instruction expand, it will become less true. Similarly, the hours when staff advising is available will have to be expanded to conform to the schedules of those students taking only evening courses.

Some students complain about confusing or conflicting advice:

> *I'm, on the whole, very satisfied with this college. Occasionally, though I get confused with all the different requirements. The major requirements are easy enough to understand, but breadth and G.E. are confusing, especially when they change. And when asking different people, even advisors, I receive different answers. Sometimes the answers even conflict. This is a minor point, though, and one, I'm sure, that will be worked out.*

> *I don't know if this is an attitude that is restricted to our department or to the whole campus, but graduate students are treated very poorly. From the first day we arrive, no one bothers to know the rules, so advisers often give poor and incorrect advice....*

> *Graduate advisors should be more in contact with students, should be aware of students' progress....case of a student in my department...who was told by the advisor that no more coursework is necessary; then in the middle of the students' research/ thesis, he was instructed (by a new advisor) to do more coursework. To avoid confrontation with faculty, the student took more courses, at the cost of his research.*

It is likely that one of Davis's great strengths in academic advising--its many different sources of academic advising--may also be a weakness. Unless all these sources coordinate exceptionally well, the conflicting advice alluded to by these students will likely be the result. In addition, the presence of so many sources of advice may lead students to seek it from inappropriate sources:

> *[A] specific problem I have had--getting false information from the secretaries in the College of L&S, which caused me to lose several (4-5 hours each time) hours of time. This happened 3 times and wouldn't if I'd been referred to someone qualified to help.*

Students are often unable to distinguish between various staff. The student who asks for advice may place a secretary in a very awkward position; it may seem better to the secretary to try to help than to shuffle the student off to another office, but the long term results may be negative.

A comment from a foreign student is worth citing in its entirety:

> *As a foreign student, I hope the campus administrators will be more sensitive to the problems foreign students have in their first quarter. The SISS has been very helpful. However, the staff is too small to provide personal contacts to the huge number of foreign students. A foreign student needs not only the information about how the school runs (which is well provided in the one-week orientation program), but also emotional support--friends. Is it possible for the school administration to utilize student organizations to help foreign students establish personal contacts with American students so that they might be able to get acclimatized to this culture sizn?*

We probably should not place too much weight on the comment of one student, nevertheless, this comment does stand as a reminder of the special problems faced by foreign students.

Finally, students do recognize attempts to improve academic advising:

> *The College of Letters & Science is making an effort toward a more personalized approach to student-staff relations; however, more needs to be done. A special effort needs to be made at the administrative and advisory levels. Small changes, for example, a simple name change for "undeclared", and large changes, like training for advisers, especially those in contact with new/ transfer students and students with special problems--financial or academic.*

CAREER ADVISING

Many academicians and students are ambivalent about the relationship between academic career and vocation. Some conceptualize education as a goal to be sought in its own right, a notion demeaned by any suggestion that a university is a training ground for future employment. Conversely, many students depend upon a university to give them the skills necessary to succeed in jobs after graduation. Few would argue that there ought to be no connection between what students learn at a university and what they do with their lives afterward. In this vein, academic advising and career advising are, or at least should be, intertwined.

Career Planning Services

Because relatively few undergraduates (28.5%) indicate ever using "career planning services," analysis of satisfaction by subgroup is not appropriate. Even though low, the usage indicated by Davis respondents is higher than that implied by the national norms (19.6%). Overall, undergraduates report being fairly satisfied with career planning services (74.7% Very Satisfied or Satisfied); no respondents report being Very Dissatisfied with career planning services. In addition, Davis undergraduates report higher mean satisfaction than the national norms (3.87 versus 3.68).

Use of career planning services increases with class standing and takes a substantial leap among seniors. This pattern suggests that students may be either unaware or unwilling to draw the connection between planning a career and planning an academic program early in their stay at Davis. It also suggests an identification of career planning and job placement by survey respondents. Such misidentification is further suggested by the fact that almost identical proportions of students responded to the questions about career planning services and job placement (26.6% and 27.2%). It should be noted, however, that the mean satisfaction with job placement is substantially below that with career planning (3.64 versus 3.82).

Comments about Career Planning Services

Comments about career planning services fall into three general groups. The first of these is very general in focus:

...I say we could all get along just fine without career planning services, counseling programs, cultural programs and mandatory student health insurance programs...

Career advisors need to show more concern for student needs and provide more direction. Need for more hands-on experience for future employment.

We should help students more in exploring career paths.

Provide informative, good, career planning for all who come to and are attending UC Davis.

The career center should be improved by making deadlines more reasonable, as well as making it more accessible to lower classmen.

This last comment comes from a senior, who appears to realize that it is advantageous to examine career options early in an academic career.

A second group of students comment specifically on the information available about career planning services, including a freshman and a junior:

A comment that I wish to make, is to strengthen the career planning program. To somehow (maybe through the Aggie) send out more information on this program. Even though I haven't used this program, it's because I didn't know about it until reading this survey. I myself am very much confused about my current major. Maybe this program could help me, but I don't know where or how to get informed.

It would be nice if there was more information available concerning both financial aid and the various career-help services available. It seems these are primarily services one must seek out for one's self at this time. For example, and this may sound a little ignorant, but coming in as a freshman I had no idea why one should take up an internship or what services were available to me to learn more.

A third group of comments concern a perceived limitation in the range of career advising available; these respondents generally seek increased assistance outside the physical sciences and engineering:

Of all UCs, Davis has best IR (International Relations) program, yet we don't even have a department...just an interdisciplinary study. Also, most of the campus programs are designed for science (physical) majors, such as: career day, etc. The only career the University sees for IR majors is travel agent.

Better career awareness days and interviews for bio sci students. The campus is not only for engineers!

More career recruitment for liberal arts--currently it is skewed towards technical fields.

More information on career options in professional schools; especially Veterinary Medicine.

Finally, and in a different vein, one law student wrote:

My professors, courses and course selection, career and placement services experiences and my experience with student government at King Hall has been ABSOLUTELY FANTASTIC! High growth, high energy, mature students--just superb. However, I would not attend Davis as an undergraduate. I feel that undergraduate students tend to be racist, sexist and generally extremely conservative. I have only used the law school's planning and placement services.

CONCLUSIONS

The survey results strongly suggest that students appreciate the complex of advising functions at UC Davis. Davis students use these services at rates comparable with or higher than those suggested by the national norms for public institutions of 10,000 or more students, and they generally report higher mean satisfaction ratings.

Davis students generally feel well-served by the variety of academic advising services offered on the campus. Nevertheless, the campus will probably have to adjust its manner of delivering academic advising as it grows, especially if it expands its hours of instruction.

Although those who avail themselves of career planning services seem generally satisfied, such planning is often done too late in a student's academic career to have a large impact on that career. This limitation is likely to be particularly serious for undergraduates who seek employment immediately after graduation.

Nevertheless, the comments indicate the presence of some weaknesses in the system. Advising programs are not fully integrated and many students do not get into the advising system early enough in their academic careers to take full advantage of the services offered. Some of these shortcomings could be remedied by improvements in the way students are informed about the presence of the variety of advising services on the campus and some by providing a single, well publicized intake into the complex of advising. What might work is an office or individual who would refer students to academic advising resources. In any case, increased coordination of the various advising functions is in order.

APPENDIX

RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS

The following tables give the responses to individual questions dealing with academic and related advising. These tables use weighted data so that individual responses are assigned a weight corresponding to the individual's representedness in the UC Davis student population by ethnicity, gender, and class level.

Tables

Table A-1	Accuracy of College Information Received Prior to Enrolling
Table A-2	College Catalog/Admissions Publications
Table A-3	College Orientation Program
Table A-4	Academic Advising Services
Table A-5	Availability of Advisor
Table A-6	Value of Information Provided by Advisor
Table A-7	Career Planning Services
Table A-8	Job Placement Services

TABLE A-1

ACCURACY OF COLLEGE INFORMATION RECEIVED PRIOR TO ENROLLING

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating
Total Group	14.0%	50.9%	27.0%	5.7%	2.3%	3.69
Men	11.8	49.4	29.3	5.4	4.2	3.59
Women	16.2	52.5	24.7	6.0	0.5	3.78
Graduate/Professional	11.0	52.9	26.1	6.9	3.1	3.62
Undergraduates:						
All	15.1	50.2	27.3	5.3	2.1	3.71
Men	12.4	47.5	31.3	4.7	4.0	3.60
Women	17.4	52.6	23.7	5.9	0.4	3.81
SAA:						
Blacks	25.7	37.7	29.9	5.5	1.3	3.81
Chicanos	25.5	43.3	20.3	9.8	1.2	3.82
Other SAA[1]	10.2	55.3	24.1	5.8	4.6	3.61
Non-SAA:						
Asians	6.5	57.8	30.0	4.4	1.3	3.64
Other Non-SAA[2]	16.4	49.1	27.1	5.2	2.2	3.72
Class Levels:						
Freshmen	14.9	50.4	27.5	4.5	2.7	3.70
Sophomores	19.1	43.9	29.8	6.9	0.2	3.75
Juniors	15.4	55.6	23.0	5.8	0.2	3.80
Seniors	12.1	49.3	29.5	4.3	4.8	3.60
Colleges:						
Letters & Science	18.5	44.7	29.4	6.0	1.4	3.73
Ag. & Env. Sciences	8.9	54.7	27.8	4.4	4.1	3.60
Engineering	14.2	64.9	15.9	4.6	0.4	3.88
National Norms[3]	12.2	49.3	24.5	8.1	2.5	3.63

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.
[3]An additional 3.4% of the national group left this item blank or responded that it Did Not Apply.

NOTE: 97.2% of all respondents answered this question.

TABLE A-2

COLLEGE CATALOG/ADMISSIONS PUBLICATIONS

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating
Total Group	19.5%	57.3%	18.5%	4.0%	0.6%	3.91
Men	15.7	59.3	20.8	3.6	0.6	3.86
Women	23.3	55.6	16.1	4.5	0.6	3.96
Graduate/Professional	12.4	52.1	27.9	6.6	1.0	3.68
Undergraduates:						
All	21.9	59.1	15.4	3.2	0.5	3.99
Men	16.9	62.3	19.0	1.8	0.1	3.94
Women	26.5	56.2	12.1	4.5	0.8	4.03
SAA:						
Blacks	28.6	53.6	15.9	2.0	0.0	4.09
Chicanos	30.4	49.7	15.9	2.8	1.1	4.05
Other SAA[1]	15.0	65.0	17.6	1.7	0.7	3.92
Non-SAA:						
Asians	14.7	70.7	11.5	3.1	0.0	3.97
Other Non-SAA[2]	23.4	56.6	16.1	3.4	0.5	3.99
Class Levels:						
Freshmen	27.7	51.5	18.1	2.4	0.2	4.04
Sophomores	25.9	63.1	7.9	3.0	0.0	4.12
Juniors	20.4	62.0	13.9	3.7	0.0	3.99
Seniors	17.2	57.9	20.3	3.3	1.3	3.86
Colleges:						
Letters & Science	24.7	54.0	17.1	3.5	0.7	3.98
Ag. & Env. Sciences	19.2	62.0	16.4	2.2	0.1	3.98
Engineering	15.4	75.6	5.1	3.8	0.0	4.03
National Norms[3]	17.3	55.0	19.6	4.1	1.0	3.86

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.
[3]An additional 3.0% of the national group left this item blank or responded that it Did Not Apply.

NOTE: 96.8% of all respondents answered this question.

TABLE A-3

COLLEGE ORIENTATION PROGRAM

	Level of Satisfaction						
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating	Percent Using Service
Total Group	28.4%	46.9%	19.1%	4.5%	1.0%	3.97	56.6%
Men	29.3	42.1	22.3	5.5	0.8	3.94	55.2
Women	27.7	51.1	16.3	3.6	1.2	4.01	58.1
Graduate/Professional	11.0	55.0	23.0	9.0	2.0	3.64	34.7
Undergraduates:							
All	31.6	45.5	18.4	3.7	0.8	4.03	64.1
Men	33.7	39.0	22.4	4.8	0.1	4.01	62.2
Women	29.8	51.0	15.1	2.7	1.4	4.05	65.9
SAA:							
Blacks	40.2	33.4	23.7	1.5	1.2	4.10	83.8
Chicanos	40.0	39.7	17.2	1.4	1.6	4.15	73.6
Other SAA[1]	21.7	61.4	15.6	1.3	0.0	4.04	68.2
Non-SAA:							
Asians	19.1	60.1	18.2	2.6	0.0	3.96	57.9
Other Non-SAA[2]	34.0	42.2	18.4	4.4	1.0	4.04	63.7
Class Levels:							
Freshmen	34.6	55.0	7.4	2.7	0.3	4.21	71.4
Sophomores	30.8	45.4	17.7	6.2	0.0	4.01	64.8
Juniors	35.3	39.5	23.5	1.7	0.0	4.08	65.5
Seniors	26.2	44.9	21.7	4.5	2.7	3.87	58.1
Colleges:							
Letters & Science	30.6	44.4	17.9	5.6	1.4	3.97	64.4
Ag. & Env. Sciences	40.2	43.6	14.6	1.5	0.0	4.23	56.5
Engineering	20.6	52.7	26.7	0.0	0.0	3.94	81.4
National Norms[3]	24.5	46.9	18.2	6.4	2.0	3.87	63.1

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.
[3]An additional 2.0% of the national group who indicated participation in an Orientation program left this item blank.

NOTE: 55.1% of all respondents answered this question.

TABLE A-4

ACADEMIC ADVISING SERVICES

	Level of Satisfaction						
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating	Percent Using Service
Total Group	14.4%	51.9%	21.7%	10.5%	1.7%	3.67	68.8%
Men	15.5	45.8	24.1	12.9	1.8	3.60	66.1
Women	13.3	57.2	19.5	8.3	1.6	3.72	71.7
Graduate/Professional	16.0	44.3	24.4	12.2	3.1	3.58	44.0
Undergraduates:							
All	14.0	53.3	21.1	10.1	1.4	3.69	77.3
Men	16.8	45.1	24.0	12.7	1.5	3.63	75.5
Women	11.6	60.5	18.7	7.9	1.3	3.73	79.0
SAA:							
Blacks	18.1	50.3	21.0	4.9	5.8	3.70	90.6
Chicanos	27.7	43.3	21.2	6.5	1.4	3.89	83.2
Other SAA[1]	11.3	58.9	19.1	6.8	4.0	3.67	82.9
Non-SAA:							
Asians	15.6	66.1	8.0	10.4	0.0	3.87	81.5
Other Non-SAA[2]	12.8	50.4	24.7	10.9	1.2	3.63	74.8
Class Levels:							
Freshmen	11.8	53.1	20.2	11.0	3.8	3.58	59.5
Sophomores	18.1	61.1	15.0	5.8	0.0	3.92	79.6
Juniors	14.0	50.4	21.9	12.6	1.1	3.64	84.1
Seniors	12.2	50.9	25.0	10.3	1.6	3.62	79.7
Colleges:							
Letters & Science	12.2	53.9	24.6	7.9	1.4	3.68	72.4
Ag. & Env. Sciences	16.4	54.8	14.3	12.8	1.6	3.72	85.4
Engineering	15.2	47.2	24.5	12.4	0.7	3.64	80.4
National Norms[3]	14.5	45.7	20.9	14.2	4.2	3.52	75.6

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.
[3]An additional 0.6% of the national group who indicated use of academic advising services left this item blank.

NOTE: 67.9% of all respondents answered this question.

TABLE A-5

AVAILABILITY OF ADVISOR

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating
Total Group	21.6%	38.3%	29.1%	7.8%	3.2%	3.67
Men	19.9	38.8	30.2	6.8	4.4	3.63
Women	23.3	37.8	28.1	8.7	2.1	3.72
Graduate/Professional	32.9	43.9	13.7	6.7	2.7	3.98
Undergraduates:						
All	17.9	36.5	34.1	8.2	3.4	3.57
Men	16.3	35.9	35.5	7.1	5.1	3.51
Women	19.4	37.0	32.7	9.2	1.7	3.63
SAA:						
Blacks	12.3	48.5	28.9	7.5	2.7	3.60
Chicanos	16.1	36.2	37.7	6.8	3.2	3.55
Other SAA[1]	13.8	33.4	39.6	7.8	5.5	3.42
Non-SAA:						
Asians	24.2	36.8	29.5	7.8	1.7	3.74
Other Non-SAA[2]	17.2	36.0	34.7	8.4	3.6	3.55
Class Levels:						
Freshmen	6.5	38.9	45.1	3.9	5.6	3.37
Sophomores	21.2	28.1	43.6	5.7	1.4	3.62
Juniors	13.3	46.8	26.5	10.0	3.5	3.56
Seniors	25.7	31.0	29.7	10.2	3.4	3.66
Colleges:						
Letters & Science	16.9	36.3	38.2	7.1	1.6	3.60
Ag. & Env. Sciences	20.3	40.2	24.8	10.5	4.2	3.62
Engineering	16.3	28.0	40.0	6.8	8.9	3.36
National Norms[3]	15.9	38.5	24.7	10.5	4.3	3.54

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.
[3]An additional 6.0% of the national group left this item blank or indicated that it Did Not Apply.

NOTE: 87.2% of all respondents answered this question.

TABLE A-6

VALUE OF INFORMATION PROVIDED BY ADVISOR

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating
Total Group	16.4%	35.2%	30.9%	10.9%	6.5%	3.44
Men	14.6	33.9	34.9	9.0	7.6	3.39
Women	18.2	36.5	26.9	12.9	5.4	3.49
Graduate/Professional	21.1	39.1	23.0	11.3	5.5	3.59
Undergraduates:	14.8	34.0	33.6	10.8	6.9	3.39
Men	12.7	32.1	38.9	7.7	8.6	3.33
Women	16.8	35.7	28.6	13.7	5.3	3.45
SAA:						
Blacks	18.8	34.1	22.8	17.6	6.6	3.41
Chicanos	24.1	26.7	33.1	14.2	2.0	3.57
Other SAA	15.5	28.5	37.8	11.5	6.7	3.35
Non-SAA:						
Asians	15.7	31.8	36.3	9.2	7.1	3.40
Other Non-SAA[2]	13.8	35.4	33.2	10.5	7.1	3.38
Class Levels:						
Freshmen	5.9	33.3	43.9	6.9	9.9	3.18
Sophomores	23.6	36.5	23.1	12.0	4.8	3.62
Juniors	14.2	29.6	37.6	11.6	6.9	3.33
Seniors	14.4	36.7	31.2	11.1	6.6	3.41
Colleges:						
Letters & Science	13.6	34.8	34.4	11.7	5.5	3.39
Ag. & Env. Sciences	17.0	40.1	27.6	9.6	5.7	3.53
Engineering	14.5	15.6	44.8	9.8	15.3	3.04
National Norms[3]	15.0	33.6	25.6	12.9	6.3	3.41

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.
[3]An additional 6.6% of the national group left this item blank or indicated that it Did Not Apply.

NOTE: 86.4% of all respondents answered this question.

TABLE A-7

CAREER PLANNING SERVICES

	Level of Satisfaction						
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating	Percent Using Service
Total Group	17.5%	55.1%	19.6%	7.9%	0.0%	3.82	27.3%
Men	20.4	45.0	20.6	14.0	0.0	3.72	26.6
Women	14.8	64.0	18.6	2.5	0.0	3.91	28.0
Graduate/Professional	16.9	47.9	19.7	15.5	0.0	3.66	23.6
Undergraduates:							
All	17.6	57.1	19.5	5.7	0.0	3.87	28.5
Men	23.6	45.5	20.3	10.5	0.0	3.82	27.9
Women	12.6	66.8	18.9	1.7	0.0	3.90	29.1
SAA:							
Blacks	10.4	54.7	35.0	0.0	0.0	3.75	35.7
Chicanos	35.6	40.2	14.0	10.3	0.0	4.01	39.7
Other SAA[1]	22.0	47.2	25.5	5.4	0.0	3.86	35.1
Non-SAA:							
Asians	18.0	60.2	18.0	3.8	0.0	3.92	35.9
Other Non-SAA[2]	16.2	58.8	18.6	6.5	0.0	3.85	25.3
Class Levels:							
Freshmen	20.4	50.1	26.8	2.7	0.0	3.88	14.6
Sophomores	32.0	51.8	13.9	2.4	0.0	4.13	21.1
Juniors	14.8	62.8	21.3	1.1	0.0	3.91	23.1
Seniors	13.8	57.4	19.2	9.5	0.0	3.76	47.4
Colleges:							
Letters & Science	18.4	56.7	19.2	5.7	0.0	3.88	28.4
Ag. & Env. Sciences	9.8	59.9	21.6	8.7	0.0	3.71	26.5
Engineering	29.5	53.7	16.8	0.0	0.0	4.13	34.1
National Norms[3]	18.0	46.0	20.5	10.1	2.9	3.68	19.6

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.
[3]An additional 2.4% of the national group who indicated use of career planning services left this item blank.

NOTE: 26.6% of all respondents answered this question.

TABLE A-8

JOB PLACEMENT SERVICES

	Level of Satisfaction						
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating	Percent Using Service
Total Group	20.0%	41.2%	24.1%	12.0%	2.7%	3.64	28.8%
Men	19.6	38.4	22.8	15.4	3.8	3.55	27.7
Women	20.5	43.3	25.3	9.1	1.8	3.72	29.8
Graduate/Professional	19.3	37.3	27.7	13.3	2.4	3.58	28.1
Undergraduates:							
All	20.3	42.5	22.8	11.6	2.8	3.66	29.0
Men	21.0	41.6	18.9	15.1	3.5	3.62	27.9
Women	19.7	43.3	26.0	8.7	2.3	3.69	30.1
SAA:							
Blacks	24.1	41.4	34.4	0.0	0.0	3.90	33.7
Chicanos	29.8	50.2	6.9	13.1	0.0	3.97	22.3
Other SAA[1]	18.3	52.6	26.3	0.0	2.8	3.84	34.9
Non-SAA:							
Asians	11.3	47.1	33.8	3.0	4.8	3.57	48.0
Other Non-SAA[2]	23.8	38.8	17.2	17.8	2.3	3.64	24.1
Class Levels:							
Freshmen	6.1	63.3	23.9	6.6	0.0	3.69	24.6
Sophomores	16.6	41.2	29.2	13.0	0.0	3.61	18.2
Juniors	28.3	43.0	21.1	7.6	0.0	3.92	26.8
Seniors	22.1	35.3	21.4	15.0	6.2	3.52	41.5
Colleges:							
Letters & Science	23.8	41.1	18.1	12.1	4.9	3.67	26.7
Ag. & Env. Sciences	17.6	39.9	32.0	10.5	0.0	3.65	29.7
Engineering	12.5	53.8	19.9	12.3	1.5	3.64	38.6
National Norms[3]	18.3	39.7	21.8	11.4	5.2	3.56	16.8

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes East Indian/Pakistani, White and Other ethnicities.
[3]An additional 3.5% of the national group who indicated use of job placement services left this item blank.

NOTE: 27.2% of all respondents answered this question.